

**REMARKS**

Claims 54-69, 71-74, 76-84, and 86-99 are pending in the application. Claims 54-55, 57, 61-62, 64, 66, 68-69, 71, 73-74, 76-81, 83-84, 86-88, 90-91, 93-94, and 96 are currently amended to clarify the subject matters as embodied in these claims, without acquiescence in cited basis for rejection or prejudice to pursue in a related application. Claims 1-53 were previously canceled. Claims 70, 75, and 85 are canceled by this Amendment. Claims 97-99 are new. No new matter has been added.

**§ 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 54-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Dieckman, D. et al., “DISCOE: Distributed Design and Analysis to Preserve Intellectual Property” (hereinafter Dieckman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,853 issued to Stephens, Jr. (hereinafter Stephens). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 54 recites at least the following limitations which claims 69 and 79 also similarly recite.

***ranking the one or more integrated circuit design resources based upon a prior activity of a user in a prior session at the portal***  
(emphasis added.)

Applicants respectfully submit that Dieckman and Stephens, neither alone nor combined, discloses the claimed limitations of “ranking the one or more circuit design resources based upon a prior activity of a user in a prior session at the portal”. The Office Action cites to col. 7, ll. 45-67, and col. 8, ll. 1-9 and ll. 15-48 of Stephens and concludes that “based upon a user selection or search, the returned information is ranked and presented to the user” and thus that Stephens discloses the above claimed limitations.

A. Applicants first respectfully submit that Stephens’s user’s selection or search does not constitute a prior activity of a user, much less a prior activity of a user in a prior session at the

portal. To the contrary, as the user's selection or search occurs on the client computer and directly results in the search result and thus does not disclose the aforementioned limitations.

B. Applicants further respectfully submit that Stephens does not disclose, teach, or suggest the above claimed limitations of ranking the one or more design resources based upon a prior activity of a user **in a prior session at the portal**.

(i) More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Stephens does not disclose ranking the resources based upon a priority activity of a user, much less in a prior session at the portal. Rather, Stephens only mentions "ranking" in the following instances. Stephens first states that the rank of the documents is "determined by the search engine according to various criteria, such as the number of time the keywords or phrases appeared in the data record". Col. 6, ll. 27-30. Stephens further states that "[t]he criteria for ranking the data records with respect to one another is typically unknown to the user." Col. 6, ll. 30-32. Moreover, Stephens does not distinguish his ranking method from the aforementioned in col. 6, ll. 27-32 as Stephens explicitly states in Figs. 4 and 5a and col. 7, ll. 52-55 that "[t]he results of the search include . . . the **rank of the document as determined by the search engine** . . . ." Finally, the passages in col. 8, ll. 15-48 as relied upon by the Final Office Action merely disclose that the clustering algorithm uses various heuristics and parameters to determine the groups and that the **client program instructions** on the client computer enable the user to sort the column of the search results by selecting the rank button in the GUI.

This ranking as disclosed in col. 8, ll. 39-45 occurs **after** the results have been returned to the user from the server in response to the search terms or phrases and is **performed by the client program instructions on the client computer** and thus does not disclose "ranking the . . . resources based upon a **prior activity of a user in a prior session at the portal**."

Furthermore, Stephens' disclosure about the clustering algorithm does not even remotely suggest the aforementioned limitations. In col. 6, ll. 27-42, Stephens explicitly states that "the criteria for ranking the data records with respect to one another is **typically unknown to the user**" and as a result, "the resulting list may contain a very large number of data records, making it prohibitive for the user to review the entire list of the responsive information . . . ." Stephens addresses this "very large number of data records" problem by using a clustering algorithm in the

client program instructions, col. 8, ll. 3-10; the clustering algorithm creates groups or clusters of documents having similar attributes for a particular category or number of categories. Col. 8, 14-17. That is, Stephens uses a clustering algorithm in the client program instructions on a client computer which create some clusters or groups of data records in which each group or cluster has “similar attributes” to address the “very large number of data records” problem. However, the clustering algorithm is not even remotely related to the claimed limitation. In col. 8, ll. 17-27, Stephens specifically discloses the criteria upon which the clustering algorithm is based. These criteria constitute various “heuristics and parameters” such as “a search threshold, a maximum number of search rounds, [ ] a maximum number of search iterations per round, the maximum number of records in the table, the maximum number of blocks per column, font sizes and color schemes.” Col. 8, ll. 19-27. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the above examples explicitly disclosed in Stephens may be reasonably interpreted so as to constitute “a prior activity of a user”, much less prior activity of a user in a prior session at the portal. Moreover, as the clustering algorithm is used by the client program instructions, col. 8, ll. 14-17, the clustering algorithm cannot be based upon any prior activity of a user in a prior session at the portal.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claim 54 is allowable over Dieckman and Stephens for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 69 and 79 respectively constitute the computer program product and the system claim reciting similar limitations as does claim 54 and are thus believed to be also allowable over Dieckman and Stephens for at least the foregoing reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the above remarks, all claims are believed to be allowable. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-4047, referencing billing number 7010223001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-4047, referencing billing number 7010223001.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: October 08, 2007

By: 

Erich C. Tzou  
Registration No. 56,927

Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (650) 849-4962  
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800